

(b) (6)  
(b) (6)

To Kay Morrison

cc

bcc

03/01/2012 03:45 PM

Subject RE: Regarding your questions on the Triangle Lake exposure study

Hi Kay Morrison,

Thank you for your response. I look forward to your responses. Perhaps I can re ask my questions without the flippancy which sneaks in on occasion. Partly its a function of being involved with chemical issues. For me it began in earnest in the last 1970's. Watching the numbers of chemicals going up geometrically and our understanding of the unintended consequences elementary and largely simplistic it's difficult to not have the jaded comments emerge. I apologize.

My questions are:

How can you ensure the public that we are not guinea pigs for chemical companies who sell us a hope and a prayer and we get unintended consequences with which no one is accountable. Responsibility, accountability and liability are thrown out the window. Instead the government asks for volunteers to monitor before and after spraying ( Bishop - Oregon). How does this make sense when cancer rates are increasing and bees and pollinators are decreasing in huge numbers?

Pogo was right, we have met the enemy and they is us.

So how can we as informed and active citizens work with you (the regulator) to insure the least possible long term damage to our ecosystems? How can we (you and us) establish liability for chemical trespass? How can we shift the act of spraying chemicals from impunity to liability?

Imagine if a foreign government was poisoning us, our waters and our lands? Homeland security and the military would be all over it. But when the poisons originate in corporate board rooms and act without respect to our basic rights, no one is held accountable. If someone points a gun at you, you can defend yourself. Is the same true with chemical guns? I don't think the question has been tested in court as yet. One day it might.

So how can we come to our collective senses and adopt and enforce the precautionary principal? Likewise what will it take to hold those who chemically trespass liable?

What effective suggestions do you have to reverse our present reality of 100,000 chemicals and no one responsible?

Regards,

(b) (6)

> Subject: Regarding your questions on the Triangle Lake exposure study  
> To: (b) (6)  
> From: Morrison.Kay@epamail.epa.gov  
> Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2012 14:50:40 -0800  
>

>  
> Dear Mr. (b) (6)  
>  
> I got your contact information from my colleague Scott Downey. He has  
> asked me to answer a couple of the questions you asked of him and Chad  
> Schulze in an email dated January 31.  
>  
> I'm one of the community involvement coordinators in the Seattle EPA  
> office. Forgive me for quoting your own words back to you, but these are  
> the questions I'm working on:  
>  
> So I ask you as a gate keeper of regulation, what do you suggest we  
> the public do to insure that being guinea pigs for these chemical  
> trespassers isn't acceptable, reasonable or consistent with the  
> preamble of our constitution, if that document is still relevant? How  
> can we bring back responsibility and liability back into the  
> equation. Or is the slow and continuing contamination of our  
> ecosystems a foregone conclusion?  
>  
> How can the EPA support and partner with educated citizens to attempt  
> to create the wisdom embodied in the 'precautionary principle'? Or is  
> it just too late and we should all just drink our 'Jim Jones' cool  
> aid and lay down and die?  
>  
> Please accept my apologies for not writing to you sooner, this email is  
> simply an opportunity for me to introduce myself and to let you know  
> that I plan to have an answer to you very soon.  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
> Kay Morrison  
> Community Involvement Coordinator  
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
> Region 10 Seattle, Washington  
> 206-553-8321  
>  
> Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can  
> change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has. --  
> Margaret Mead  
>